



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/805,555	03/13/2001	Gregory D. Gudorf	SONY 3.0-019	2660
530	7590	04/07/2005	EXAMINER	
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			SIMITOSKI, MICHAEL J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/805,555

Applicant(s)

GUDORF ET AL.

Examiner

Michael J Simitoski

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 and 35-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 and 35-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The response of 12/27/2004 was received and considered.
2. Claims 1-32 & 35-38 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. In light of Applicant's response, the objections to claims 22 & 32, rejections of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 and rejections of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §101, set forth in the previous Office Action are withdrawn.
4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/27/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Further, in light of Applicant's response, additional grounds of rejection based on the newly cited Shaw reference are provided.
5. Applicant's response (p. 10-13) suggests that the supplied references do not contain pre-stored information. However, the Examiner submits that the information must be pre-stored somewhere, as it is known. Pre-storing can occur, for example, by the user him/herself. Further, as the method of claim 1 includes the step of receiving pre-stored information including age information, but makes no use of the age information, the limitation "age information" is given little patentable weight.
6. Applicant's response (p. 14, ¶1 – p. 16, ¶2) suggests that Soular lacks age data. However, applicant's claim recites "age data *representative* of said user's age". Since a viewing level is something set by a parent for a child, the viewing level is data representative of a user's age. Further, Soular explicitly recites "viewing levels according to the age of the their children" (p. 1, ¶5). Yuen simply teaches that a method of providing the age data is in the form of a code that

Art Unit: 2134

represents the age data, thereby allowing access based on the age data. Claim 18 provides no boundaries for the “age data” except that it is “*representative* of a user’s age”. While the specification appears to identify age data as a number in the form of a date of birth, there is a wide range of information and identifiers that are “representative” of a user’s age. Further, there are a number of locations where such information is commonly “stored”, as reflected in the rejections of record.

7. Applicant's response (p. 16, ¶3 – p. 17, ¶4) suggests that neither Tabuki nor FreeZone '00 suggest “pre-storing personal information regarding said user, said personal information including an e-mail address and a value associated with a personal characteristic.” However, applicant is directed to col. 3, lines 1-2, for example, where Tabuki discloses that the authentication date is pre-stored.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-17, 22-32 & 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1-17, 23-32 & 35-38, it is unclear how and why “pre-stored” information is *received*.

Regarding claims 1-17, 23-32 & 35-38, it is unclear where the information is pre-stored.

Art Unit: 2134

Regarding claims 1-17, it is unclear whether “with at least one processor” modifies “said user” or represents that at least one processor receives the pre-stored information.

Regarding claims 13-14, “satisfying a cut-off value” is ambiguous because a cut-off value can be an upper, lower or any other bound and satisfying the cut-off can comprise a comparison of any or multiple of those bounds.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "said step of storing" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 29 recites the limitation "said browser" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1-2, 13-14, 17, 21 & 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by “Keeping Parents in the Loop on a Kid-Centered Site” by The FreeZone Network (FreeZone).

Regarding claims 1-2, 13-14 & 35, FreeZone discloses receiving a request for information/access from a user/child under 12, receiving personal information/age associated

with said user/child, said personal information including an address (home address for those without printers), sending a permission request to an address/parent's address, said permission request including a request for permission to provide information/registration to said user/child, receiving permission in response to said permission request, and sending information/email to said user/child in response to said request for information/access (page 2, ¶3-9).

Regarding claim 17, FreeZone lacks explicit disclosure of omitting the permission request if permission was received in the past. However, it is inherent that if a user is already registered, the user will log in, and hence the permission request will be omitted.

Regarding claim 21, FreeZone discloses receiving a request from a user/child for access to content/service, receiving personal information including age data representative of said user's age, if said age data indicates that said user is older than a particular age/12, then sending an email to said address indicating that the request was received (page 2, ¶3-8), and sending the content/service to said user/child if permission (given inherently by parent's not de-registering) is received in response to said email (page 2, ¶3-8).

12. Claims 1-5 & 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,311,211 to Shaw et al. (Shaw). Shaw discloses receiving a request for information/join advocacy group from a user/advocacy network member (col. 21, lines 14-33), receiving pre-stored personal information/user info and member profile associated with said user with at least one processor/server (col. 8, lines 43-46 & col. 9, lines 15-50), said pre-stored personal information including an address (col. 8, lines 43-46 & col. 9, lines 3-5) and age information (col. 23, line 2), sending a permission request/advocacy message to said address (Fig. 15),

receiving permission in response to said permission request (Fig. 15) and sending information/follow up message to said user in response (Fig. 16 & col. 23, lines 18-21).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “List Owner’s Manual for LISTSERV, version 1.8d” by L-Soft International, Inc. (Lsoft). Lsoft discloses receiving a request for information/subscription request from a user (§2.12.2, ¶1), receiving pre-stored personal information/email address (§2, ¶1) associated with said user, said personal information including an address/email address (§2, ¶1), sending a permission request/confirmation to said address (§4.10, ¶2), said permission request including a request for permission to provide information to said user, receiving permission/confirmation in response to said permission request (§4.10), and sending information/welcome message to said user in response to said request for information (§6.8). Lsoft lacks including age information. However, ABA teaches that to restrict access to content (p. 1, ¶1), a user supplies a PIN and date of birth (p. 3) (which are pre-stored in the verification system). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lsoft to require a PIN and date of birth. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

Art Unit: 2134

perform such a modification to restrict the system to users of a certain age, as taught by ABA (p. 1, ¶1 & p. 3).

15. Claims 3-4 & 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FreeZone, as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of “FreeZone Privacy Statement” by FreeZone (FreeZone ’00), dated May 2000.

Regarding claim 3, FreeZone lacks explicit disclosure of the personal information including a user name. However, FreeZone ’00 teaches that the FreeZone service requests a FreeZone name (page 1, ¶5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a user name in the personal information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification because the FreeZone service requests a user name for registration, as taught by FreeZone ’00 (page 1, ¶5).

Regarding claim 4, FreeZone lacks explicit disclosure of the personal information including a category of information. However, FreeZone ’00 teaches that a user can request to receive the FZ Times (page 2, ¶1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a category of information the user/child is entitled to receive. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to receive an email newsletter, as taught by FreeZone ’00 (page 2, ¶1).

Art Unit: 2134

Regarding claim 15, FreeZone discloses FreeZone discloses that if registration is accepted, the user/child and parent is notified that registration is accepted (page 2, ¶5) (step of notifying said user/child at said second address if said permission was received), but lacks specifically the personal information including a second address. However, FreeZone '00 teaches that the user/child supplies both an email address and parents email address (page 2, ¶1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supply a second address. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to allow both the child and parents to be notified that registration has been accepted (part of the same FreeZone service), as taught by FreeZone '00 (page 2, ¶1).

16. Claims 5-7 & 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FreeZone, as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of “The sticky kids’ privacy issue” by Network Family News (NFN).

Regarding claims 5-7, FreeZone lacks the address comprising an email address. However, NFN teaches that one way for parents to assign permission to a child over the Internet is by emailing consent (page 1, §2, ¶2-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a parent’s email address rather than a home address. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to allow parents to supply consent over the Internet, as taught by NFN (page 1, §2, ¶2-3).

Regarding claim 22, FreeZone lacks sending the response via email. However, NFN teaches that one way for parents to give consent is through an email containing a digital signature (page 1, ¶4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to respond with an email. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to give consent for a child to access data, as taught by NFN (page 1, ¶4).

17. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FreeZone, as applied to claim 1 above, in view of U.S. Patent 6,167,382 to Sparks et al. (Sparks). FreeZone lacks the personal information including credit card information, where the information is sent back to the user for accuracy verification. However, Sparks teaches an Internet commerce system that boasts the benefit of allowing the design and purchasing of products from a single entry point in a computer system (col. 1, lines 5-16). Sparks also teaches the entry of billing information (credit card) (Fig. 60) and the sending of that information back to a user for confirmation of its accuracy (Fig. 61) and chooses “cancel” to return to supply the correct information (Fig. 61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include credit card information in the personal information and to send the information back to the user for accuracy verification. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to purchase products, such as access to FreeZone using networked computers, as taught by Sparks (col. 1, lines 5-16, Fig. 60 & Fig. 61).

Art Unit: 2134

18. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FreeZone in view of Sparks, as applied to claim 8 above, in further view of U.S. Patent 5,963,915 to Kirsch. FreeZone, as modified above, lacks the option not to supply the credit card information and lacks prompting the user to enter the information if the user had opted not to include it in the request. However, Kirsch teaches that the use of cookies to store account/billing information is useful because it allows the user to be authenticated via a pre-established relationship (col. 7, lines 58-62). The cookie (which is just a piece of data, often encrypted, that contains information about the sender) can be sent with the request to process a transaction; if the cookie is not present, the user is prompted to enter the information required for the purchase (col. 7, line 55 – col. 8, line 20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to give the user the option to include the credit card information in a request for information/registration and to prompt the user for the credit card information if the user opted not to include it in the original request (established a pre-established relationship). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to allow the user to utilize a pre-established relationship for authentication and to establish a new one if a relationship hadn't been previously established, as taught by Kirsch (col. 7, line 55 – col. 8, line 20).

19. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FreeZone. FreeZone lacks explicit disclosure of sending a notification is another request for information is received. However, FreeZone teaches that the service and registration works in such a way where a single child can sign-up, which depending on age can require parental permission (page

Art Unit: 2134

2). Further, the examiner takes Official Notice that sending a request for permission each time a request for information is submitted is old and well established in the art of Internet commerce as a method of obtaining permission. For instance, in an Internet newsgroup requiring moderator approval for registration, if an initial request is unanswered, when the user submits a subsequent request, the moderator will receive an additional request notice to account for accidental loss of requests. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to send a notification to said address when a request for information is received said user/child before said permission is received. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to account for accidental loss of requests. This advantage is well known to those skilled in the art.

20. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,706,427 to Tabuki in view of "SafeSurf Internet Rating System Receives Broad Support From Online Community" by Soular et al. (Soular), in further view of U.S. Patent 5,488,409 to Yuen et al. (Yuen). Tabuki discloses authentication data being stored on a client of a network (col. 2, lines 1-3), sending a request to a server/verification server for access to content (col. 2, lines 35-40), receiving a request for authentication data and providing the authentication data (col. 2, lines 55-64) and gaining access or being denied access to said content dependant upon whether the authentication data is valid (col. 2, lines 40-50). Tabuki lacks the authentication data being age data and verifying the user based on being older than a particular age. However, Soular teaches that SafeSurf, a highly supported rating system, allows parents to designate viewing levels based on the age of their children to only accept material they have determined appropriate for their

Art Unit: 2134

family (pages 1-2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use age data as a means for access to restricted material.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to only accept material they have determined for their family, as taught by Soular. As modified, Tabuki lacks providing the age data. However, Yuen teaches that to allow a allow different levels of access, each level can be assigned a password, where the passwords correspond to ages (col. 58, lines 50-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide age data/password to the server. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to allow different levels of access, as taught by Yuen (col. 58, lines 50-57).

21. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabuki in view of Soular in view of Yuen, as applied to claim 18 above, in further view of “Net Nanny Features and Benefits” by Foster & Associates (Foster). Tabuki, as modified above, lacks maintaining a log of each request for content. However, Foster teaches that the Net Nanny software can be configured to “log all URLs accessed” (page 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to maintain a log of each request for content. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to gain the benefits of monitoring data access through a PC, as taught by Foster (pages 1-2).

22. Claims 23-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabuki in view of FreeZone '00, in further view of FreeZone.

Regarding claims 23-25, 27 & 30-32, Tabuki discloses storing personal information/authentication data (col. 2, lines 1-3), sending a request to a server/verification server for access to content (col. 2, lines 35-40) and providing the authentication data (col. 2, lines 55-64) to access to the content. Tabuki lacks the authentication data including an email address and a value associated with a personal characteristic, receiving at said email address a request to permit access to said content, the receiving step being dependent upon a comparison of the stored value and the cut-off value, and sending the requested content dependent upon whether another user replies to the request to permit access. However, FreeZone '00 teaches that the FreeZone service collects a child's email and a parent's email address to contact parents regarding registration (page 2, ¶1), with the benefits of access to interactive features (page 2, ¶4-7). Kids can also sign up to receive the FZ Times, a newsletter (page 3, ¶4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a parent's email address and age data/birthday and to send the user content if access is granted. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to contact parents during registration and to provide registered users with a newsletter, as taught by FreeZone '00 (page 2, ¶4-7 & page 3, ¶4). Further, FreeZone teaches that to protect children's privacy, a request is sent to another user/parent to request permission for the child to access the FreeZone service (page 2, ¶5) dependent on whether the child is over a certain age/cut off value (page 2, ¶5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive at the email address, a

Art Unit: 2134

request to permit access to content, dependent on a comparison of a stored value and the cut-off value. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to protect the privacy of children online, as taught by FreeZone (page 2, ¶5).

Regarding claim 26, Tabuki, as modified above, discloses using a password which is required to modify the personal information (see FreeZone '00, page 4, ¶2).

Regarding claim 28, Tabuki, as modified above, lacks explicitly requesting content via a browser through the Internet. However, as modified above by FreeZone, it is understood that FreeZone is an Internet website and therefore content must be requested through a browser (page 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to request content from the Internet and through a browser. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to use the FreeZone service, as taught by FreeZone (page 1, §Introduction).

Regarding claim 29, Tabuki, as modified above, lacks entering a password each time a browser is executed. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that requiring a password to access an application is old and well established in the art of computer security as a method of controlling who is able to use the browser and loading personalized settings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to require entry of a password each time a browser is opened and only send the personal information if the correct password has been entered. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to load personalized settings and control access to the browser. This advantage is well known to those skilled in the art.

23. Claims 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over FreeZone, as applied to claim 35 above, in view of “Free On-Line Dictionary” by LinuxGuruz.

Regarding claim 36, FreeZone lacks specifically a web server, but FreeZone is an Internet-based service. LinuxGuruz teaches that web servers are simply processes that accept http requests from browsers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the system of claim 35 on a web server. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to send out information in response to requests, as taught by LinuxGuruz (page 1).

Regarding claim 37, FreeZone lacks specifically a Java applet, but FreeZone is an Internet-based service. LinuxGuruz teaches that Java is a web language that is platform independent that uses “applets” (page 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Java applets. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to gain the freedom of platform-independence, as taught by LinuxGuruz (page 3).

Regarding claim 38, FreeZone lacks specifically implementing the system in a browser plug-in. However, LinuxGuruz teaches that plug-ins are used to extend the functionality of a parent application, such as a web browser (page 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the method in a browser plug-in. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to extend the functionality of the browser, as taught by LinuxGuruz (page 5).

Art Unit: 2134

24. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw, as applied to claim 5 above, in further view of Lsoft. Shaw lacks the email address not being the email address of said user. However, Lsoft discloses a user requesting information (user signing up) (§2.12.2 ¶1), sending a permission request to an address/administrator (§2.12.2 ¶1), receiving permission/confirmation and sending information/list messages. This is done to control subscription requests (§2.12.2 ¶1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable a user to request information, send a permission request to an address, receive permission and send information to the user in response to said request for information, wherein the address the permission request is sent to is not that of the user. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to control subscription requests, as taught by Lsoft (§2.12.2 ¶1).

25. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw and Lsoft, as applied to claim 6 above, in further view of NFN. Shaw, as modified above, lacks the user being a child and the email address being the child's parent's email address. However, NFN teaches that one way for parents to assign permission to a child over the Internet is by emailing consent (p. 1, §2, ¶2-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to email the parent for permission. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to allow parents to supply consent over the Internet, as taught by NFN (p. 1, §2, ¶2-3).

Art Unit: 2134

26. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw, as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Sparks. Shaw lacks the personal information including credit card information, where the information is sent back to the user for accuracy verification. However, Sparks teaches an Internet commerce system that boasts the benefit of allowing the design and purchasing of products from a single entry point in a computer system (col. 1, lines 5-16). Sparks also teaches the entry of billing information (credit card) (Fig. 60) and the sending of that information back to a user for confirmation of its accuracy (Fig. 61) and chooses "cancel" to return to supply the correct information (Fig. 61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include credit card information in the personal information and to send the information back to the user for accuracy verification. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to purchase products, such as access to Shaw's advocacy group using networked computers, as taught by Sparks (col. 1, lines 5-16, Fig. 60 & Fig. 61).

27. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw and Sparks, as applied to claim 8 above, in further view of Kirsch. Shaw, as modified above, lacks the option not to supply the credit card information and lacks prompting the user to enter the information if the user had opted not to include it in the request. However, Kirsch teaches that the use of cookies to store account/billing information is useful because it allows the user to be authenticated via a pre-established relationship (col. 7, lines 58-62). The cookie (which is just a piece of data, often encrypted, that contains information about the sender) can be sent with the request to process a transaction; if the cookie is not present, the user is prompted to enter the

Art Unit: 2134

information required for the purchase (col. 7, line 55 – col. 8, line 20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was to give the user the option to include the credit card information in a request for information/registration and to prompt the user for the credit card information if the user opted not to include it in the original request (established a pre-established relationship). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to allow the user to utilize a pre-established relationship for authentication and to establish a new one if a relationship hadn't been previously established, as taught by Kirsch (col. 7, line 55 – col. 8, line 20).

28. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw, as applied to claim 1 above, in further view of FreeZone.

Regarding claims 13-14, Shaw lacks the information being restricted to users “satisfying” a cut-off value and further comprising the step of comparing the age information with said cut-off value. However, FreeZone teaches that a user must submit a birthday for registration and online requests are processed if the user's age information satisfies a cut-off (p. 2, ¶4-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to omit the steps of sending and receiving a value of the age information contained in personal information satisfies said cut-off value. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to process applications differently depending on age, as taught by FreeZone (p. 2, ¶4-5).

Regarding claim 15, Shaw lacks a second address associated with said user, said method further including the step of notifying said user at said second address if said permission was

Art Unit: 2134

received in response to said permission request. However, FreeZone teaches that if registration is accepted, the user/child and parent is notified that registration is accepted (page 2, ¶5) (step of notifying said user/child at said second address if said permission was received), but lacks specifically the personal information including a second address. However, FreeZone '00 teaches that the user/child supplies both an email address and parents email address (page 2, ¶1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supply a second address. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to allow both the child and parents to be notified that registration has been accepted (part of the same FreeZone service), as taught by FreeZone '00 (page 2, ¶1).

29. Claims 16, 21-29 & 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw.

Regarding claim 16, Shaw lacks sending a notification to said address if a request is received from said user before said permission is received. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that sending a notice in response to an unanswered request is old and well established in the art of Internet communication as a method of accounting for accidental loss of requests. For instance, if a request is sent to an email address to “complete registration by clicking on this link and entering the code provided”, which is a common method of signing up for services on the Internet, is unanswered, a subsequent request will be sent to account for the chance that the user has accidentally deleted the email. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to send a notification to said address

if a request is received from said user before said permission is received. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to account for accidental loss of the requests. This advantage is well known to those skilled in the art.

Regarding claims 21-25, 27-28 & 32, Shaw discloses receiving a request for information/join advocacy group from a user/advocacy network member (col. 21, lines 14-33), receiving pre-stored personal information/user info and member profile associated with said user with at least one processor/server (col. 8, lines 43-46 & col. 9, lines 15-50), said pre-stored personal information including an address (col. 8, lines 43-46 & col. 9, lines 3-5) and age information (col. 23, line 2), sending a permission request/advocacy message to said address (Fig. 15), receiving permission in response to said permission request (Fig. 15) and sending information/follow up message to said user in response (Fig. 16 & col. 23, lines 18-21). Shaw lacks if said age data indicates that said user is older than said particular age. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that age-restriction is old and well established in the art of voting as a method of restricting users to a particular voting age. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to only execute the method of Shaw if said user is older than a particular age. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to restrict users below a cut-off age group from voting-related procedures. This advantage is well known to those skilled in the art.

Regarding claim 26, Shaw discloses storing a password (col. 8, lines 54-55), but lacks explicitly requiring the password to make changes to the personal information. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that password entry to change personal information is old and well established in the art of authentication as a method of limiting changes of a user's data to

Art Unit: 2134

that user. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to require the password for further changes to the personal information. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to verify that the user has the authority to change the personal information. This advantage is well known to those skilled in the art.

Regarding claim 29, Shaw lacks entering a password each time said browser/application is executed, wherein the personal information is not sent unless said password is associated with said personal information. However, However, the examiner takes Official Notice that requiring a password to access an application is old and well established in the art of computer security as a method of controlling who is able to use the browser and loading personalized settings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to require entry of a password each time a browser is opened and only send the personal information if the correct password has been entered. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to load personalized settings and control access to the browser. This advantage is well known to those skilled in the art.

30. Claims 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw, as applied to claim 35 above, in view of LinuxGuruz.

Regarding claim 36, Shaw lacks specifically a web server, but Shaw is an email-based service. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that Internet-based email interfaces are old and well established in the art of email as a method of allowing users to check email from any computer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2134

time the invention was made to use Shaw's invention with a web browser via the Internet. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to allow the email service in Shaw's invention to be accessed anywhere. This advantage is well known to those skilled in the art. Further, LinuxGuruz teaches that web servers are simply processes that accept http requests from browsers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the system of claim 35 on a web server. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to send out information in response to requests, as taught by LinuxGuruz (page 1).

Regarding claim 37, Shaw lacks specifically a Java applet. LinuxGuruz teaches that Java is a web language that is platform independent that uses "applets" (page 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Java applets. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to gain the freedom of platform-independence, as taught by LinuxGuruz (page 3).

Regarding claim 38, Shaw lacks specifically implementing the system in a browser plug-in. However, LinuxGuruz teaches that plug-ins are used to extend the functionality of a parent application, such as a web browser (page 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the method in a browser plug-in. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to extend the functionality of the browser, as taught by LinuxGuruz (page 5).

Conclusion

31. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Simitoski whose telephone number is (571) 272-3841. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:45 a.m. - 4:15 p.m.. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays from 6:45 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached at (571) 272-3838.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231


Or faxed to:
(703)746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:
(571)273-3841 (Examiner's fax, for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Art Unit: 2134

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


MJS
March 21, 2005



GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100